



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

पृष्ठ : 48	शिमला, शनिवार, 29 जनवरी, 2000/9 माघ, 1921	संख्या : 5
विषय सूची		
भाग-1	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	132—143
भाग-2	वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि ..	—
भाग-3	अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयको पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैन्शियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि ..	143—148
भाग-4	स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्यूनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नार्टफाइट और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग ..	—
भाग-5	वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन	148—152
भाग-6	भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन	—
भाग-7	भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं	—
—	अनुपूरक	—

29 जनवरी, 2000/9 माघ, 1921 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'प्रवाशरण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं:—

विज्ञप्ति की संख्या	विभाग का नाम	विषय
संख्या एक0डी0एस0-एम0एन0डी0 (एफ0) 14/95-7499-7553, दिनांक 27 दिसम्बर, 1999.	खाद्य एवं आपूर्ति विभाग	जिला दण्डाधिकारी मण्डी द्वारा मिट्टी के तेल के बोक व परचून भावों का पुनःनिर्धारण।
संख्या ई0एक्स0एन0-ए0(3)-17/93, दिनांक 9 दिसम्बर, 1999.	आबकारी एवं कराधान विभाग	हिमाचल प्रदेश आबकारी एवं कराधान विभाग अधीक्षक ग्रेड-II (वर्ग-III अराजपवित्त) भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 1999 इसके अंग्रेजी पाठ सहित।

भाग-1-वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं
हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट
NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-1, the 12/13th January, 2000

No. HHC/Admn. 6(24) 74-V-1237.—The High Court of Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers vested u/s 12(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is pleased to appoint Shri Bhupesh Sharma, Sub Judge-cum-JMIC(2), Mandi as Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate for Mandi district for the disposal of urgent work pertaining to the Court of Senior Sub Judge-cum-C. J. M., Mandi during the leave period of Shri P.C. Sharma, Senior Sub Judge-cum-C. J. M., Mandi w. e. f. 17-1-2000 to 30-1-2000.

Shimla-1, the 13/14th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-104/88-I-1203.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant *ex post facto* sanction of 30 days commuted leave w. e. f. 8-11-1999 to 7-12-1999 in favour of Shri Rajinder Kumar Sharma, Sub Judge-cum-Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nurpur.

Certified that Shri Sharma has joined the same post and at the same station from where he proceeded on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Sub Judge-cum-Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nurpur, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 13/14th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-76/76-II-1214.—The Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 4 days earned leave w. e. f. 16-2-2000 to 19-2-2000 with permission to prefix special casual leave from 24-1-2000 to 15-2-2000 and to suffix Sunday falling on 21-2-2000 in favour of Shri M. D. Sharma, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Kangra at Dharamshala.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Addl. District and Sessions Judge(1), Kangra at Dharamshala, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 13/14th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-22/74-III-1224.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 4 days earned leave with effect from 13-1-2000 to 16-1-2000 with permission to suffix special casual leave with effect from 17-1-2000 to in 8-2-2000 in favour of Shri O. P. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Mandi.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of District and Sessions Judge Mandi, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 13/14th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-84/77-III-1187.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 7 days earned leave with effect from 10-1-2000 to 16-1-2000 with permission to prefix Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 8th and 9th January, 2000 and to suffix special casual leave w. e. f. 17-1-2000 to 30-1-2000 in favour of

Shri P. C. Sharma, Senior Sub Judge-cum-Chief J. Magistrate, Mandi.

Certified that Shri Sharma is likely to joined same post and at the same station from where proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Sharma would have continued to hold the post of Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Mandi, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/Admn. 6(23)/74-XI-1438.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H.P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare Shri P. C. Sharma, Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Mandi as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the court of District and Sessions Judge, Mandi and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T.A. etc. in respect of class-III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid court under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Shri O.P. Sharma, District and Sessions Judge, Mandi with effect from 31-1-2000 to 8-2-2000.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/Admn. 6 (24) 74-V-1400.—The High Court of Himachal Pradesh, in exercise of the powers vested u/s 12 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is pleased to appoint the Sub Judge-cum-JMIC, Nurpur Bisheer as Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate for Kinnaur district for the disposal of urgent work pertaining to the Court of Senior Sub Judge-cum-C.J.M., Kinnaur at Reskong, Poo during the leave period of Shri R.K. Mittal, Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM Kinnaur at Reskong-Poo w. e. f. 14-2-2000 to 29-2-2000 with permission to prefix Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 12 and 13-2-2000 or until he returns from leave.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-218/95-I-1409.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 17 days earned leave w. e. f. 3-2-2000 to 19-2-2000 in favour of Shri G. L. Arora, Special Judicial Magistrate, Shimla.

Certified that Shri Arora is likely join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Arora would have continued to hold the post of Special Judicial Magistrate, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-225-96-1419.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to grant 14 days earned leave with effect from 16-2-2000 to 29-2-2000 with permission to prefix Special Casual leave w. e. f. 2-2-2000 to 15-2-2000 in favour of Shri Yogesh Jaswal, Sub Judge-cum-JMIC (2), Rohru.

Certified that Shri Jaswal is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Shri Jaswal would have continued to hold the post of Sub Judge-cum-JMIC(2), Rohru, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/Admn. 6(23)/74-XI-1450.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him

परन्तु उ
विचार किया
पद के भर्ती
परन्तु य
की अपेक्षा
अप्राप्त हो
विचार की

rule 1.26 of the H. P. Financial Rules, 1971, is pleased to declare the Senior Sub-Judge-cum-Kangra at Dharamshala as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Kangra at Dharamshala also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T.A. etc. in respect of class-III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid court under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Shri M. D. Sharma, Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Kangra at Dharamshala w.e.f. 16-2-2000 to 19-2-2000 with permission to prefix special casual leave w.e.f. 24-1-2000 to 15-2-2000 and to suffix Sunday falling on 20-2-2000, or until he returns from leave.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/Adma.6(23)/74-XI-1451.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice in exercise of the powers vested in him under rule 1.26 of H.P. Financial Rules, 1971, Volume-I, is pleased to declare Shri Bhupesh Sharma, Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Mandi as Drawing and Disbursing Officer in respect of the Court of District and Sessions Judge, Mandi and Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Mandi, and also the Controlling Officer for the purpose of T.A. etc. in respect of class-III and IV establishment attached to the aforesaid court under head "2014—Administration of Justice" during the leave period of Shri P. C. Sharma, Senior Sub Judge-cum-CJM, Mandi with effect from 10-1-2000 to 16-2-2000 with permission to prefix Second Saturday and Sunday falling on 8th and 9th January, 2000 and to suffix Special Casual leave w.e.f. 17-1-2000 to 30-1-2000 or until he returns from leave.

Shimla-1, the 15/17th January, 2000

No. HHC/GAZ/14-16/95-1472.—The Hon'ble Chief Justice is pleased to sanction 14 days earned leave w.e.f. 31-1-2000 to 13-2-2000 with permission to prefix Sunday falling on 16-1-2000 and to suffix Sunday and Special Casual Leave w.e.f. 16-1-2000 to 30-1-2000 in favour of Shri Yashwant Singh, Sub Judge-SDJM, Rajgarh.

Certified that Shri Yashwant Singh, is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Certified that Shri Yashwant Singh, would have continued to hold the post of Sub Judge-cum-SDJM, Rajgarh, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar (Vigilance).

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार
PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 4th January, 2000

No. Per. (A-I) B (2) 6/84.—In continuation of this Department's Notification of even number dated the 6th January, 1998, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to allow Dr. Jagmohan Singh Chauhan to continue as Director of Horticulture, Himachal Pradesh on deputation basis on usual terms and conditions, till further orders, in public interest.

By order,

A. K. GOSWAMI,
Chief Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 5th January, 2000

No. Per. (AP-B) B (1)-1/98.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri S. M. Kataria, IAS (Retd.) Member, H. P. Subordinate Services Selection Board as Chairman of the said Board for a period

of 5 years from the date he enters upon his office or until he attains the age of 65 years whichever is earlier on the terms and conditions as specified in the H. P. Subordinate Services Selection Board, Terms and Conditions (Members), 1998.

By order,

A. K. GOSWAMI,
Chief Secretary,

Shimla-3, the 6th January, 2000

No. Per. (A-IV)B(6)-1/2000.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order transfer and postings of the following H. P. Administrative Service Officers with immediate effect in the public interest :—

1. Smt. Madhu Bala Sharma (HAS:83), Additional Secretary Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, Shimla is transferred and posted as Additional Director (Rural Development)-cum-Ex-Officio Deputy Secretary (RD) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh.
2. Shri Amit Kashyap (HAS : 90), Joint Director (RD)-cum-Ex-Officio Deputy Secretary (RD) to the Government of Himachal Pradesh is transferred and posted as Deputy Secretary, Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, Shimla.
3. Shri Moti Lal (HAS:97), Assistant Commissioner to Deputy Commissioner, Mandi is transferred and posted as Sub Divisional Officer (Civil) Kullu, Himachal Pradesh against vacancy.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order that Shri B. R. Kondal (HAS :97), Land Acquisition Officer, H. P. S. E. B., Mandi, Himachal Pradesh shall also hold additional charge of the post of Assistant Commissioner to Deputy Commissioner, Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, in addition to his own duties, in the public interest, with immediate effect, till further orders.

By order,

A. K. GOSWAMI,
Chief Secretary.

HOME DEPARTMENT

CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-2, the 4th January, 2000

No. LLR-B(1)-9,75.—Please add "rule 3 (2)" in fourth line of this department notification of even number dated 1st July, 1999 after the word "under" and delete the words "the provisions".

Sd/-

FC-cum-Secretary (Home).

सिचाई एवं जन स्वास्थ्य विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 13 जनवरी, 2000

संख्या सिचाई 11-101/99-कुल्लू.—यतः राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु ताजना गांव बजौरा, तहसील कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू में पेयजल योजना हाट बजौरा जल भण्डारण टैंक के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिशेष में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हैं या हो सकते हैं, को जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1994 को धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाक़ की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित श्रवण अनुमत सभी अन्य कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिसर में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के तीस दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, कुल्लू के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

विस्तृत विवरणी

जिला : कुल्लू

तहसील : कुल्लू

गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (बीघों में)
बजौरा	1096/1	0 5 0

आदेश द्वारा,

कंवर शमशेर सिंह,
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव।

धतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामतः* के लिए भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित विस्तृत विवरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपर्युक्त* प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सभी सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों की सूचना के लिए घोषणा की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन समाहर्ता भू-अर्जन, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला-3 को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन के लिए आदेश लेने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक, समाहर्ता भू-अर्जन, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला-3, के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

*गांव डूह, तहसील शिमला, जिला शिमला में उठाऊ पेयजल योजना जुटवड़हटी के निर्माण के लिए।

संख्या सिचाई 11-36/99-शिमला

शिमला-2, 15 नवम्बर, 1999.

विस्तृत विवरणी

जिला : शिमला		तहसील : शिमला	
गांव	खमरा नं०	क्षेत्र बीघा बिस्वा	
1	2	3	4
डूह	1/1	0	09
	2	0	02
	3	1	05
	5/1	0	06
किता . .	4	2	02

आदेश द्वारा,

एस0 एस0 परमार,
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव।

*गांव रजाना, तहसील शिमला, जिला शिमला में सीवरेज ट्रीटमेंट प्लांट शिमला शहर के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या सिचाई 11-48/99-शिमला

शिमला-2, 13 जनवरी,

1	2	3
रजाना	526/409/1	12
	407	2 0
	524/405	0 12
	406	0 10
	408	2 14
	399	1 19
किता .. 6		20 19

आदेश द्वारा,

कंवर शमशेर सिंह,
वित्तायुक्त एवं सचिव।

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171002, the 29th December, 1999

No. 19-8/97-Shram.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under section 17(I) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of the awards in the Rajpatra announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court in respect of the following cases:—

Sl. No.	Ref. No. hnd Parties	Section	Remarks
1	2	3	4
1.	Ref. No. 38/99—Lata Rani c/o Om Dutt Sharma Vs. Manager M/s Elin Electronics Ltd. Factory, 73/75 Sector-I, Parwanoo.	10	For publication.
2.	Ref. No. 236/98—Sh. Rajesh Kumar Vs. M. D. M/s Nektor Productor (India) Ltd., B/wala. Solan.	10	-do-
3.	Ref. No. 9/98—Smt. Kiran Bala Vs. M. D. M/S Nektor Products (I) L'd., B/wala.	10	-do-
4.	Ref. No. 79/97—Workers Vs. M/s C.F.J.V. Bhavanager, Distt. Kinnaur.	10	-do-
5.	Ref. No. 51/95—C.F.J.V. Vs. M/s C.F.J.V. Bhavanager Distt. Kinnaur.	10	-do-
6.	Ref. No. 134/97—Munna Khana/ Jamaludeen c/o Sh. A. K. Sharma, Ahata Rai Sahib Kalka Haryana Vs. M. D. M/s Trilokpur Shardo Rubber, Plot No. 61, Sector-I, Parwanoo.	10	-do-
7.	Ref. No. 85/96—Himachal Pradesh Bijli Mazdoor Ekta Union Vs. Chairman, HPSEB, Shimla & others.	10	-do-
8.	Ref. No. 78/96—Smt. Yashodha Devi Vs. Monal Public School, Sanjauli, Shimla.	10	-do-
9.	Ref. No. 45/93—Ramesh Kumar & others Vs. The Deputy Commissioner, Distt. Una & others.	10	-do-
10.	Ref. No. 132/96—Shri Rattan Singh and 4 others Vs. Sub-Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, Ghumarwin, Distt. Bilaspur (H. P.) & Director of Agriculture, H.P., Shimla-5.	10	-do-

परन्तु
विचार
पद के
मर्त
परन्तु
की
अपक्ष
अपक्ष
विचार

2	3	4
1. Ref. No. 47/95—Shri Nagu Ram & 3 others Vs. H.R.T.C. Employees Co-operative Centre Bus Stand, Shimla, through its Secretary.	10	For publication
2. Ref. No. 49/92—Shri Narinder and Miss Alka Sharma Vs. Deputy Commissioner, Una-cum-Chairman Chintpurni Temple Trust, Tehsil Amb, District Una & others.	10	-do-
13. Ref. 27/97—Vinod Kumar Walia s/o Shri Banwari Lal, H/N 5 86, Mohalla AR Butt, Kalka, Haryana Vs. Eicher Tractors Ltd., Industrial Area, Sector-2, Parwanoo (Solan) through General Manager,	10	-do-
14. Ref. No. 160/98, Shri Yash Pals/o Shri Kanshi Ram Vs. Sh. Rakesh Khurana, Shop No. 1, Goel Market, Sector-1, Parwanoo.	10	-do-
15. Ref. No. 100/97—Smt. Vidya Devi Vs. Principal, Maharishi Vidya Mandi Dhanat, Tehsil Dehra, Distt. Kangra, (H.P.) & others.	10	-do-

By order,
Sd/-
Commr.-cum-Secretary.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 38/99

Decided on 26-11-99

Miss Lata Rani c/o Om Datt Sharma ..Petitioner.

Versus

Manager, M/s. Elin Electronics Ltd.
Factory 73/75 Sector-1, Parwanoo ..Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

26-11-1999 : Present : None for the petitioner.

Shri P. K. Sharma, AR for the respondent.

It seems that either the petitioner has settled the matter with the respondent or is not interested to pursue the petition. Therefore, this petition is dismissed. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Seal.

Sd/-
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, 26-11-99.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 236/98
Decided on 26-11-99

Sh. Rajesh Kumar ..Petitioner.

Versus

M. D. M/s Nektor Productor (India) Ltd. B/wala Solan .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

26-11-1999: Present: None for the petitioner.
Shri Kishan Singh Verma, Advocate for the respondent.

Shri Verma has filed documents with regard to the payment made to the petitioner and one application which he has addressed to the Labour Commissioner that he has received the entire payment from the respondent. In view of the documents, he has received the full and final payment from the respondent and also moved the application that nothing more survives in the reference and the claim of the petitioner. Therefore, the claim of the petitioner in view of the documents is answered in affirmative with regard to his claim as per application of the petitioner. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Sd/-
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court. 26-11-99.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 9/98
Decided on 24-11-99

Smt. Kiran Bala ..Petitioner.

Versus

M.D.M/s Nektor Products (I) Ltd. B/wala .. Respondent.
Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947.

24-11-1999 : Present : None for the petitioner.
Shri Kishan Singh Verma vice
Shi P. P. Chauhan, Advocate for the respondent.

Petitioner served by way of affixation as ordered on 21-8-1999. But none present. Shri Kishan Singh Verma appeared on behalf of the respondent. It seems that the petitioner herself is not interested to pursue this petition or she has settled the claim with the respondent. Therefore, this petition does not survive. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Sd/-
Seal. Presiding Judge,
Labour Court. 24-11-99.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 79/97
Decided on 12-11-99

Workers .. Petitioner.

Versus

M/s C. F. J. V. Bhavanagar, Distt. Kinnaur .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Taken up Today :

12-11-99: Present: Sh. Hem Raj, AR for petitioner.
Sh. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate for respondent.

In view of Ex. PA filed by the parties, the matter has been amicably settled by the petitioners and its respondent. The reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Govt. for its publication.

Seal. Sd/-
Presiding Judge,
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

**In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla**

Ref. 51/95
Decided on 12-11-99

C.F.J.V. .. Petitioner.

Versus

M/s C.F.J.V. Bhavanagar Distt. Kinnaur .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

12-11-99: Present : Sh. Hem Raj, AR for petitioner.
Sh. Rajnish Maniktala, Advocate for respondent.

In view of the Ex. A filed by the parties, the matter has been amicably settled by the petitioners and the respondents. Hence, the reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Govt. for publication.

Seal. Sd/-
(M. R. CHAUDHARY),
Presiding Judge,
H.P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Shimla

Ref. 134/97
Decided on 24-11-1999

Munna Khan s/o Jamaludeen c/o Sh A. K. Shorma, Ahata Rai Sahib Kalka Haryana .. Petitioner.

Versus

M. D. M/s Trilokpur Shardo Rubber Plot No. 61, Sector-1, Parwanoo .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

24-11-1999 : Present : Shri A. K. Sharma, AR for the petitioner.
None for the respondent.

In view of the statement made by Shri A. K. Sharma, the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. Therefore, this petition does not survive as the claim having been fully satisfied. The copy of this order be sent to the appropriate government for its publication.

Seal. Sd/-
(M. R. CHAUDHARY),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court. 24-11-99.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. 85/96
Decided on 12-11-99

Himachal Pradesh Bijli Mazdoor Ekta Union .. Petitioner.

Versus

Chairmon, HPSEB, Shimla & others .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

12-11-99: Present: Sh. Hem Raj, AR for petitioner.
Sh. S. P. Sharma, AR for respondent.

This reference is dismissed as withdrawn with a liberty to agitate the matter with a proper time and proper cause of action in due course. Let a copy of this order be sent to appropriate Govt. for its publication.

Seal. Sd/-
(M. R. CHAUDHARY),
Presiding Judge, H. P. Industrial
Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

**In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding J
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla**

Ref. No. 78 of 1996
Instituted on 3-8-96
Decided on 1-11-1999

Smt. Yashodha Devi .. Petitioner

Versus

Monal Public School, Sanjauli, Shimla-171006 .. Respondent.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioner : Shri Hem Raj, AR.

For respondent : Shri Nareshwer Chandel, Advocate.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate government on 27-7-1996 with regard to the termination of the petitioner. During the course of proceedings, the parties have arrived at amicable settlement. The respondent management has paid a sum of Rs. 10,000/- as full and final settlement of her claim and will not have any right of re-instatement or back wages. This settlement has been agreed upon by the petitioner.

So, in view of the statements made by the parties the respondent has paid a sum of Rs. 10,000/- as full and final settlement of the claim and the petitioner will not claim here re-instatement and back wages and the reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this order be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Announced in the Open Court today this 1st day of November, 1999.

Seal. Sd/-
(M. R. CHAUDHARY),
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge, Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 45 of 1993
Instituted on 26-2-1993
Decided on 1-11-1999

1. Romesh Kumar son of Shri Piar Singh, 2. Lukesh Kumar son of Shri Siri Ram, 3. Param Jeet Singh son of Jai Gopal, 4. Miss Punam Kumari d/o Varinder Nath, 5. Smt. Swarna Devi w/o Baldev, 6. Ashok Kumar son of Mool Raj .. Petitioner.

Versus

1. The Deputy Commissioner, District Una, Himachal Pradesh, 2. The Mata Chintpurni Management Trust, Chintpurni, District Una, through its Executive (Chief), 3. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Amb, District Una, Himachal Pradesh .. Respondents.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For petitioners : Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, AR.

For respondents: Shri N. S. Chandel, Advocate.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government with regard to the termination of the petitioners. The reference is reproduced hereunder:—

“कि क्या रमेश कुमार व अन्य 5 कर्मचारियों को मन्दिर अधिकारी, माता चिन्तपूरणी प्रबन्धक ट्रस्ट, चिन्तपूरणी, तहसील

परन्तु उ
विचार किया
पद के मर्त्या
परन्तु य
को अपक्ष
अपक्ष हों
विचार के

अम्ब, जिला ऊना, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा 10 दिन का नोटिस तथा बिना कारण व किसी जांच किए नौकरी से निकालना सही व न्याय संगत है। यदि नहीं, तो उपरोक्त कामगार किस राहत व क्षतिपूर्ति के हकदार है?"

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

2. After receiving the reference, the notices were issued to the parties. Both the parties appeared in the Court and the petitioners filed the statement of claim, where in it is averred that the applicants were appointed as daily waged Clerks by the respondent No. 3. The applicant No. 1 was appointed on 7-4-89, Applicant No. 2 was appointed on 2-3-1990, Applicant No. 3 was appointed on 31-1-90, applicant No. 4 was appointed on 6-2-1990, applicant No. 5 was appointed on 6-2-90 and applicant No. 6 was appointed on 16-3-90. The petitioners continued to perform their respective duties regularly and uninterruptedly with due devotion to the satisfaction of the employee till their services were terminated on 31-12-1990. All the petitioners were paid @ Rs. 46/- per day. That the respondent No. 3 arbitrarily issued the short period retrenchment notices to the petitioners while retaining juniors in the Job. It is averred in the claim that the respondent never served any explanation nor any notice casting any stigma on their conduct nor any enquiry was ever held by the respondents. The petitioners proved that they be reinstated with full back wages in continuity in service.

3. Reply to the petition was filed by the respondents wherein the following preliminary objections were raised that the applicants are not entitled for any relief because they do not fall in the definition of workmen under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. That the applicants were engaged purely on daily wages. The applicants were not appointed on regular basis and more over no appointment orders were issued to them as such question of their re-industction doe not arise.

4. On merits, it is averred that the petitioners were engaged by respondent No. 3. When it was realised by the trust that there was no requirement of the daily wages workers/Clerk, their services were discontinued. But prior to their termination, notices were duly served upon the petitioners and their names were struck off from the register. The respondents denied that the petitioners were performing their duties regularly. It is averred that it is expected from every employee to work in such a way as to promote the religious sentiments of the pilgrims and maintain the sanctity of the diety. The petitioners acted in such a way with which the sentiments of the visitors hurt so they were terminated. The abstract of the proceedings of the meeting of the Trust held on 20-12-90 is Annexure R-1. It is admitted in the reply that the junior Clerks were retained by the respondents. It is also averred that the Temple is not an industry as the temple is being run on donations of the pilgrims. Hence, the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not apply. It is averred in the reply that the behavior of the petitioners were not upto the mark, hence, they were terminated. In nut-shell, the claim of the petitioners were controverted and denied.

5. Replication to the reply was filed by the petitioners wherein the stand taken in the reply was controverted and the stand taken in the claim was re-asserted.

6. On the basis of the reference and the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed:—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioners is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ? If so, its effect ? OPP.
2. Relief.

7. I have hard the parties present in the Court and gone through the entire record. To decide the fate of the issues, my findings are as under:—

FINDINGS

ISSUE NO: 1.	Yes
RELIEF	Petition Accepted.

8. *Issue No. 1.*—First of all, I will discuss the oral as well as documentary evidence of both the parties. Petitioner Shri Romesh Kumar appeared as PW-1 and deposed that he was employed by the respondent on 7-4-89 as Clerk on daily wages. Thereafter he worked continuously till 31-12-90. He worked for more than 240 days during the said period. On 21-12-1990, he was served with a notice for 10 days w. e. f. 31-12-90, however, he was not paid any compensation nor wages in lieu of one month's notice. No charge-sheet was served upon him nor any enquiry was held and his work remained during the said period satisfactory. He tendered in evidence Ex. PA, which is a copy of the notice. Remaining five petitioners were also terminated accordingly. Thereafter, the approached the Hon'ble High Court through a writ petition. At the time of his termination, he was getting Rs. 46/- per day. Shri Jiwan Kumar who was junior to him is still working and prayed that he be re-instated with back wages.

9. Shri Lokesh Kumar appeared as PW-2 and deposed on the similar lines that he was inducted into the employment on 2-3-90 and was terminated on 31-12-90. He was also served with a notice Ex-P. C. He was getting Rs. 47/- per day at the time of his termination.

10. Shri Paramjeet Singh appeared as PW-3 and deposed on the similar lines that he was employed on 30-1-90 and was terminated on 31-12-1990 by the respondent. A notice was given on 21-12-90 vide Ex. P D but no compensation was paid to him. Junior to him is still working with the respondent.

11. PW-4 Smt. Swarna Devi appeared and also deposed on the similar lines that she was employed on 6-4-89 and was terminated on 31-12-90. A notice Ex. P. E. was served upon her, but she was not paid any wages in lieu of notice nor any compensation was paid to her.

12. On the other hand, respondent examine one Shri Bhuri Singh Accountant as RW-1, who deposed that he has been working since 3-9-1991 as Accountant in the respondent office. The petitioners had been terminated prior to his appointment as a result of decision taken by the Managing Committee on 20-12-1992. The copy of the proceedings is Ex. R-1 and Ex. RW-1/A is the relevant abstract of the decision. In cross-examination, he admitted that no enquiry was held against any of the petitioners before they were terminated. He could not say whether wages for one month were paid to these workers at the time of their termination. He also admitted that no retrenchment compensation was paid to the petitioners.

13. It is a admitted case of the respondents that the petitioners were employed by the respondents on daily wages. All the petitioners were employed as daily waged Clerks. The simple case of the respondents is that the services of the petitioners were terminated on account of misconduct and lack of misdeed. However, no enquiry was conducted. If it is the stand of the respondents and the petitioners were terminated on account of misconduct, then the enquiry should have been conducted, which has not been done in the present case. So, action on the part of the management is illegal. The petitioners worked with the respondent for more than 240 days and their services were terminated without any notice and retrenchment compensation in lieu of notice, in such situation, section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is directly attracted. If a person has completed 240 days in service, then his services without following the procedure laid down under Section 25-F of the act cannot be dispensed with. In view of the amount of evidence placed in record, the petitioners have worked for more than 240 days in a calendar year. Therefore, if the retrenchment order is to be passed by the respondents, then the procedure laid down in Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act has to be followed, which has not been done in the present case. The simple case of the respondents is that the services of the petitioners were terminated on account of misconduct is of no help to the respondents as no enquiry was conducted as I have mentioned hereinabove. This is the

case of temple trust and falls within the definition of Industry as has been elaborately discussed in LLJ-1999(2) 304 in a case Jasbir Singh V/s State of Himachal Pradesh and others. The case is directly applicable to the facts of the present case. Thus, the termination of the petitioners is bad and illegal as no inquiry was initiated as per the stand taken by the respondents that the services of the petitioners were terminated on account of their misconduct. Therefore, I hold that the termination of the petitioners is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The point is answered accordingly.

RELIEF

14. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that the termination of the services of the petitioners is illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 because all the petitioners have completed more than 240 days in a calendar year while working with the respondents. Therefore, I order their re-instatement with continuity in service and they will remain the employees of the respondents till the services are dispensed with in accordance with law. The employees are present in the Court and have foregone the back wages as they were engaged in the Temple Trust. They are not entitled to the back wages. The reference is answered in affirmative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 1st day of November, 1999.

Seal.

M. R. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 132 of 1996
Instituted on 1-5-1999
Decided on 27-10-99

Shri Rattan Singh and 4 others .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. Sub-Divisional Soil Conservation Officer,
Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh.

2. Director of Agriculture, Himachal Pradesh,
Shimla-5.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes
Act, 1947

For petitioners : Shri Sunder Singh, AR

For respondents: Shri A. K. Gupta AR

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government with regard to the termination of the petitioners on 3-12-1996. The reference is reproduced hereunder:—

“Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Rattan Singh, Amar Singh, Deep Chand, Baldev Dass and Dev Raj by the (i) Sub-Divisional Soil Conservation Officer, Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur and (ii) Director of Agriculture, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-5 w. e. f. 31-5-1996, without any notice, chargesheet, enquiry and without compliance of Section 25 (F) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and employing junior persons is legal and justified, if not, to what relief of service benefits and amount of compensation those aggrieved workmen are entitled?”

2. After receiving the reference, the notices were issued to the parties. The petitioners appeared, but respondents did not appear and were proceeded against *ex-parte*. Ex. parte award was made. However, the matter was again remanded by the Hon'ble High Court. The claim of the petitioners is that S/Shri Rattan Singh, Amar Singh, Deep Chand, Baldev Dass and Dev Raj joined services on daily wages as Beldar, Mate & Mason w.e.f. 8-10-1986, 5-9-90, 4-6-90, 1-11-1991 and 1-3-1986 respectively and worked continuously as such till 31-5-1996.

The applicants are workmen as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. All workmen have completed more than 240 days continuously. No notice under Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was given by the respondents, when the services of the petitioners were terminated no compensation in lieu of notices was paid by the respondent and prayed that all the petitioners be reinstated with full back wages.

3. Reply was filed by the respondent. In reply, it is averred that the casual labour under the Soil Conservation section of the respondents department is only engaged for carrying out 100% subsidising works and thus comprise of the construction of water storage tanks, Farm Ponds, Nalla training works, earthen walls, kuhl etc. In accordance with the programmes approved and promulgated by the State Government of Himachal Pradesh under specified budget provisions to provide massive assistance to the small and marginal farmers, Scheduled Castes families and for increasing the agriculture production by providing irrigation facilities etc. That in order to carry out such specified schemes/works and the labourers are engaged from the nearby locality where particular scheme is executed. The services of the labourers are co-terminus with the completion of the aforesaid scheme/work. Respondent No. 1 used to engage the petitioners as casual labour against particular project on availability of the works intermittently. The particular for the engagement of the petitioners casual labour in respect of specified project are given in the tabulated statements *vide* Annexure R/1. It is pertinent that the petitioners are concealing the facts before the court with regard to the filing of the O. A. before the Administrative Tribunal for the same relief, but the same was dismissed as withdrawn though the respondents filed reply before the Administrative Tribunal. That the petitioners do not fall in the ambit of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. The function of the respondents to render help to the Agriculturist and the labourers are employed for a short period till the work is complete and the labourers cannot be employed continuously as no such big projects which is of permanent in nature are being executed by the respondents. Therefore, Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is not attracted in case of the petitioners. In mut shell the claim of the petitioners is controverted and denied.

5. No rejoinder was filed by the petitioners despite the opportunities given. So in view of the reference and the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 18-8-99 after the case was remanded back by the Hon'ble High Court:—

1. Whether the termination of the petitioners are illegal in view of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? If so, its effect? OPP.
2. Relief.

6. I have heard the parties present in the court and have gone through the entire record. To decide the fate of the issue, my findings are as under:—

FINDINGS

- | | |
|----------------|---------------------|
| 1. Issue No 1. | No |
| 2. Relief. | Petition dismissed. |

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

7. Issue No. 1:— First of all, I will discuss the oral as well as the documentary evidence of both the parties.

परन्तु उ
विचार किया
पद के मर्त्या
परन्तु प
की अपेक्षा
अपान है
विचार के

Rattan Singh appeared in the Court and tendered an affidavit which is on record as Ex. P-1. Petitioner was examined by the respondent and he deposed that he was employed by the respondent as beldar on a daily basis at Dalwin. He remained as such upto 1-5-96. He worked in Jhandutta Section with the respondent. On 1-5-96, he was removed from the job on the pretext that no job is available with the respondents. He worked with the respondents on different works. He denied that he was employed to complete 240 days. He admitted that small schemes were framed by the respondent on the request of the farmers and in order to complete these works, they were employed by the respondents. He also admitted that when the work of one scheme was over, the respondent had to wait for another scheme and when the scheme was available with the respondent, they were employed. They were employed by the respondents on muster roll basis. He also admitted that there was no big project with the respondent which could involve more labourers for more time, these were the smaller schemes which were undertaken by the respondents at the request of the local people and in order to complete these schemes, the respondents used to give work to them.

With regard to the other petitioners, they have also filed their affidavits in evidence Ex. P-2 to Ex. P-5.

8. On the other hand, respondent examined one Shri A. K. Gupta as RW-1, who deposed that the petitioners were employed by the respondent in soil conservation schemes. The services of the petitioners are not permanent, rather it is casual because they are engaged whenever the work is available with the respondent for the small needs of the farmers. The work of the respondent starts only when the land is not cultivated and is free from crops. Rattan Singh has not completed 240 days during a calendar year. He tendered the details of days during which the petitioners worked with the respondent vide Ex. R-1. The petitioners are not entitled for continuity in service because the scheme of the respondents is now changed, now the farmers are doing this work at their own and department assess the value and make payment to the farmers. The petitioners were seasonal workers while working with the respondent in small schemes undertaken by the respondent for the benefit of the farmers. In new scheme the committee is formed i. e. the Pradhan of the Illaqua along with JE of the respondent i. e. Sectional Incharge. The farmers nominate one person themselves for the work, the farmers along with the family members also execute the work and take the payment on the completion of scheme owned when the work is approved by the employee of the respondent. When the project or the scheme of the respondent is over, then the person whose ever are engaged are disengaged. He was cross-examined and he tendered photo copies of the muster roll of all the five petitioners which are Ex. R-2 to Ex. R-6. The petitioners were working in different schemes intermittently. River Valley project is also undertaken by the respondent and when the work is over, the workers are disengaged. National Water Shed Development scheme was undertaken by the respondent and it was extended for another five year period, but there was a condition in this project that the local people will be employed and they will execute the project. Now the project is to be executed by the Farmer's Committee. He denied that Des Raj, Ratni Devi, Sita Ram were sent to Agriculture Department. According to him, the petitioners were working on the casual work.

9. The claim of the petitioners is that once they have completed 240 days in a calendar year while working with the respondents, then before terminating the services, then the respondents are duty bound to comply with the provisions of Section 25-F of the act which has not been done in the present case nor any compensation in lieu of notice was paid by the respondents to the petitioners. According to them, the petitioners worked with the respondent from 1986 till 1996 though intermittently. According to the petitioners, now in view of the period as shown in the muster rolls Ex. R-2 to Ex. R-6, they are entitled for regularisation. The petitioners also claimed that they shall be re-instated in continuity in service along with back wages.

10. On the other hand, the claim of the respondent is that the Soil conservation schemes are undertaken for the benefit of small and marginal farmers to take small projects for the benefits of the farmers and when the work is over, the labourers engaged for disengaged. So the work is not perineal in nature, so the continuity in service and regularisation do not arise. Further strand taken by the respondent and it has come in evidence that new schemes have been framed where the Pradhan of the Illaqua and one officers of the respondent participate and the farmers who use to take the benefit of such schemes, gather together and execute the work together and receive the payment when the work is over. The petitioners though have worked from 86 to 96, but not regularly, but intermittently when the work was available with the respondents. This work is of a seasonal in character, as such can be executed when the fields are open and crop is not cultivated. This shows that the work is of a seasonal in character. If such type of labourers are employed though they have completed 240 days in a calendar year, cannot get the benefit of Section 25-F of the Act.

11. In view of the amount of evidence and nature of work undertaken by the respondents, I am of the confirmed view that the seasonal employees as proved by the respondents who had put in 240 days of service cannot take the benefit of Section 25-F of the Act because no work which is perineal in nature is available with the respondents. On the similar preposition, the law has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India with regard to the work which is seasonal in nature in case 1998 (1) LLJ-728 in a case titled *Tamil Nadu Civil Supplies Corporation Workers' Union v. Tamil Nadu Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd. and others*, where the Hon'ble Madras High Court has clearly laid down that where the work is of a seasonal in character, no direction can be issued by the Court to regularise the services of the petitioners. The petitioners admitted themselves that they were being employed by the respondents when the work was available with the respondents. There are another cases on similar lines as reported in 1995 (5) SLR 232 and 1997 (4) SLR-586 S. C. In these cases also, the similar view has been endorsed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India that if the work is of a seasonal character, then no direction can be given to regularise the workers. The work shall be of a perineal in nature when the workers can take benefits of Section 25-F of the act when their services were terminated after complying and completing 240 days service.

12. I have seen the entire evidence, statements of the petitioners coupled with the affidavits filed and documents filed by the respondent and I am of the view that the termination of the petitioners is neither bad nor illegal nor Section 25-F of the act is attracted as the work is of a seasonal character undertaken by the respondent for the small and marginal farmers and when the work is over, the workers are disengaged. Hence, the point is answered accordingly.

RELIEF

13. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that the termination of the petitioners is not illegal, therefore, the petitioners are not entitled to the relief as claimed. Petition is rejected with no costs. Further, the respondents are directed to prepare the seniority list of the workers and if any work is to be executed, the petitioners shall be called on first come first serve basis. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law.

Announced in the Open Court today this 27th day of October, 1999.

Seal.

M. R. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Judge,
H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla.

In the Court of Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Presiding Judge,
Himachal Pradesh Labour Court, Shimla

Ref. No. 47 of 1995
Instituted on 2-11-1995
Decided on 12-11-1999

1. Shri Nagu Ram, 2. Shri Devi Saran, 3. Shri Mela Ram and, 4. Shri Santosh Kumar c/o CITU OFFICE, 9-Bawa Building, The Mall, Shimla-3 ... Petitioners.

Versus

H. R. T. C. Employees Co-operative Canteen Bus Stand, Shimla, through its Secretary ... Respondents.

Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For petitioner : Shri Hem Raj, AR

For respondent : Shri Mohinder Singh, Advocate.

AWARD

This reference has been received from the appropriate Government on 27-9-1999 with regard to the termination of the petitioners. The reference is reproduced hereunder:—

"whether the termination of S/Shri Nagu Ram, Devi Saran, Santosh Kumar w. e. f. 10-3-1995 and that of Shri Mela Ram w. e. f. 1-1-1995 by the Managing Committee of Himachal Road Transport Corporation Employees' Co-operative society canteen without pay charge-sheet and enquiry is legal and justified if not, to what relief of back wages and service benefits, the above workers of the canteen are entitled to?"

2. After receiving the reference, the notices were issued to both the parties. Both the parties appeared in the Court. Petitioners filed the statement of claim wherein it is averred that the petitioners were appointed by the respondent management on different dates to perform the duties of skilled, semi-skilled and un-skilled nature. The petitioner No. 1 was employed as Cook on 16-4-1992 and worked with the respondent till 4-1-95. The petitioner No. 2 was appointed on 5-5-1992 as Tanduria and petitioner No. 3 was appointed on 28-5-92 as cook. Like wise the petitioner No. 4 was appointed on 31-8-1992 as Waiter and as such were terminated on 4-1-1995. illegally and no retrenchment compensation was paid nor any notice was given to the petitioners. Therefore, the petitioners claim their re-instatement with full back wages.

3. Reply to the claim was filed by the respondent where in the preliminary objection was taken that the petition is non-maintainable in the present form and shape, hence is liable to be dismissed.

4. On merits, it is averred that petitioner No. 1 was employed on 16-4-92, the petitioner No. 2, was appointed on 16-5-92, petitioner No. 3 on 28-5-92 and the petitioner No. 4 was employed on 31-8-1992. All the petitioners have duly been paid as per the minimum rates of wages fixed by the State Government as their category in this behalf. The petitioners after being employed were not discharging their duties properly and to the satisfaction of the customers as well as the management. Not only this, the petitioners were creating indiscipline and were in the habit of disobeying the orders of the management. Even the crockery and other valuable articles which were entrusted to the petitioners and were being used for the purpose of running the canteen were found missing and consequently a notice dated 25-12-1994 was issued to the petitioner No. 1 the Copy is Annexure R-1. The costs of the items as aforesaid which were found missing in the canteen were assessed at Rs. 3275.30. Despite of the issuance of the show cause notice dated 25-12-1994.

The petitioner No. 1 has not given any explanation reply the petitioners were not discharging duties properly and were creating indiscipline, the rest of the petitioners 2 to 4 were dispensed with w. e. f. 1. However, as per the reconciliation made between parties before the Labour Inspector, Shimla dated 31-3-95 S/Shri Devi Saran and Santosh Kumar were re-engaged whereas Shri Mela Ram did not report for duty. After being re-engaged, the petitioners S/Shri Devi Saran and Santosh Kumar again created indiscipline, deliberately refused to perform their duties and as such, their service were again dispensed with w. e. f. 11-3-1995. The show cause notice dated 1-3-95 was issued to the petitioner Shri Nagu Ram as he was not performing his duties to the satisfaction of the customers as well as to the satisfaction of the management. Again Shri Nagu Ram failed to improve his working and also failed to give any explanation to the show cause notice dated 4-3-95 and consequently, his services were dispensed with w. e. f. 11-3-95. The petitioners have been given ample opportunity to reform and improve their working and rather on the other hand, they are guilty of disobedience and creating indiscipline in the canteen. In nut shell the claim of the petitioners was controverted and denied.

5. On the basis of the reference and the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor framed the following issues on 8-7-1996:—

1. Whether the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is applicable to the employment of the petitioners? OPP.

2. If issue No. 1 supra is held in affirmative, whether the termination of the services of the petitioners is in contravention of the said act on the grounds as alleged? OPP.

3. Relief.

6. I have heard the parties present in the Court. I have also gone through the entire record. To decide the fate of the issues, my findings are as under:—

Point No. 1. Yes

Point No. 2.

The case of the petitioners falls under the I. D. Act, 1947 and termination is in contravention of the I. D. Act.

Relief

Petition accepted.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

7. Issues 1 & 2.—Both these issues are inter linked and inter connected. Therefore, I will take up both these issues together for discussion as in order to avoid duplicacy in evidence.

8. First of all, I will discuss the oral as well as the documentary evidence of both the parties. Petitioner Nagu Ram appeared as PW-1 and deposed that on 16-4-1992 he was inducted into the employment as daily rated cook on payment of Rs. 780/- consolidated as wages. He worked till 1-4-1995 when he was retrenched by the respondent unlawfully. He was not served with any kind of notice nor paid the wages of the notice period nor was he paid the retrenchment compensation. No domestic enquiry was held against him. He denied that some items like plates, spoons etc. which were kept in his custody were found to be missing therefrom. He also denied that the valuation of those articles of items was Rs. 3275.32 paise. He also denied that he refused to receive show cause notice dated 25-12-1994. He also denied that he had been repeatedly warned by the respondent to mend his working and behaviour. He was thrown out from the employment on 11-3-1995. He worked throughout the year till he was retrenched.

9. Shri Devi Saran appeared as PW-2 and deposed that he was inducted into the employment on 5-5-92

परन्तु उ
विचार किया
पद के अर्थात्
परन्तु य
की अपेक्षा
अधिक है
विचार के

Tanduria on payment of Rs. 550/- per month and it was enhanced to Rs. 720.00. He was retrenched on 3-4-95 unlawfully by the respondent. He worked continuously throughout the year on all working days till his unlawful retrenchment by the respondent. He was not served upon any notice nor he was paid wages of the notice period and retrenchment compensation. No enquiry was initiated against him. In cross-examination, he denied the allegations of the respondents that his behaviour was not upto the mark.

10. Shri Santosh Kumar appeared as PW-3 and deposed that he was inducted into the employment as Waiter on 25-8-92 on payment of Rs. 500/- per month. It was increased to Rs. 700/- per month. He was terminated from employment on 10-3-95 by the respondent unlawfully. He has worked continuously during all the working days in year till his illegal retrenchment. He was not given any notice nor was he paid wages of the notice period and retrenchment compensation. No enquiry was conducted. He denied that his working was not upto the mark and he was indulged in bad behaviour.

11. Shri Mela Ram appeared as PW-4 and deposed that he was inducted into the employment on 28-1-92 on payment of Rs. 775/- as cook and was terminated on 4-8-95 unlawfully. No notice was given by the respondent. He also denied that his work was not satisfactory.

12. On the other hand, respondent examined Shri Rajinder Kumar as RW-1, who deposed that Nagu Ram was employed by the respondent on 16-4-92, Mela Ram and Santosh Kumar were employed by the respondent on 28-5-1992. Devi Saran was employed on 28-5-95. Whatever pay was prescribed by the State Government was paid to the petitioners. Nagu Ram was working as Cook. Mela Ram was Tenduria, Santosh Kumar and Devi Saran were working as Waiters. All the petitioners worked for about 2½ years sincerely and thereafter, all the four petitioners tried to disturb the working of the canteen of the respondent. The petitioners were advised time and again to co-operate with other employees of the canteen and they were adamant to create hurdle. The petitioners were given notice on 25-12-94. The copy of the notice is Ex.R-1. No reply was given by Nagu Ram for the notice issued to him. Other three petitioners were terminated on 1-1-1995 without any notice. The petitioners approached the Labour Inspector and during the conciliation proceedings, the petitioners were again appointed on 31-1-1995. After re-engagement of the petitioners in conciliation proceedings, again all four joined hand to create hurdle in order to run the canteen. On 11-3-95, there was a shortage of water and the petitioners were asked to bring the water from nearby tap, so that the food prepared will not be wasted. They refused to bring the water. The petitioners were given all the facilities of labour laws. This behaviour was not good. Thereafter, the notices were issued on the same day *qua* the termination of the petitioners. All the three petitioners, Mela Ram, Devi Saran and Santosh Kumar were given notices alongwith cheques *vide* Ex. R-2, Ex.R-3 and Ex. R-4. Nagu Ram was also given notices. The original document of the petitioner is not with the respondent. Whatever rates prescribed by the Government was paid to the petitioners. Earlier the Government fixed the wages Rs. 937/- and thereafter it was increased to Rs. 1110/-. He denied that the workers formed the union and pressed the wages and the respondent society released the wages. The behaviour of the workers in the canteen was not upto the mark as was required. The complaint of the workers were made to me as he was the President of the Canteen in December, 1994. The earlier complaint was verbal. However, the written complaint came in March, 1995 which is Ex. R-5. On 11-3-95, he asked the petitioners to bring water as there was shortage in the Canteen at about 11.00 A. M. When the behaviour of the petitioners was not upto the mark they were charge-sheeted. No said copy was shown to the Court today. The list of witnesses were also attached with the charge-sheet. However, it is not shown to the Court. No enquiry officer was appointed. No warning in writing was given to the petitioner about their behaviour. No charge-sheet was served on the petitioner on Ex.R-5. No copy of Ex. R-6 was sent to the petitioners through

post. He admitted that there is no written complaint made by the Manager of the canteen who was looking after the worker of the canteen. No writing was shown or brought to this Court as the crockery was handed over to the petitioners. He denied that when the workers demanded the due wages, they were thrown of the job.

12. Shri Rakesh Kumar appeared as RW-2 and deposed that he was employed by the respondent in the year, 1992 as Salesman. The petitioners are known to him. They were also employed in the year, 1992 by the respondent, in the canteen. The petitioners were working nicely with the respondent canteen. The petitioners used to obey the orders of the superiors, but some time they were reluctant to obey. The behaviour of the petitioners with the customers was good. He admitted that when the petitioners were removed from job, he was not present. He also admitted that no complaint in writing was given by any person. He also admitted that all the petitioners approached the respondent to give them wages sanctioned by the state Government. He admitted that the management was not happy on account of the demand raised by the petitioners for minimum wages. He also admitted that the management removed from job the petitioners on account of that they demanded more wages. He admitted that no enquiry was conducted against the petitioners.

This is the oral as well as the documentary evidence of both the parties on record.

13. The first question raised by the respondent that the case of the petitioner is not covered under the Industrial Disputes Act. I think that this contention is straight away to the repelled because the case of the petitioners squarely falls and covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, as they were employed by the respondent in Canteen. If any retrenchment was to be passed then it was incumbent upon the respondent to follow the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, but the same has not been done by the respondent.

14. Another contention raised by the respondent that the behaviour and work of the petitioners was not upto the mark and they used to disobey the orders of the respondent. I think this is the contention of respondent RW-2 is the witness of the respondent who supported the case of the petitioners that they worked with the respondent sincerely and they used to obey the orders of the respondent and their services were dispensed with because they raised the demand to pay higher wages. This version of RW-2 fits in with the version of the petitioners. No enquiry was conducted nor any Enquiry Officer was appointed by the management nor any charge-sheet was issued to the petitioners. Therefore without following the provisions of the Industrial Disputes act while dispensing the services of the petitioners by the respondent shall be declared as illegal and unlawful.

15. With regard to the statutory canteen where the workmen are working in the canteen has been held in a case A. I. R. 1998-SC-2577 (2nd) supplement in a case Indian PETROCHEMICALS CORPORATION LTD. AND ANOTHER vs. SHARMIK SENA AND OTHERS wherein the law settled by the apex Court of the country in earlier cases have been reviewed and certain directions were upheld in this appeal matter before the apex Court. Certainly, the facts of the present case also are the similar and the canteen is an establishment of the management is a statutory canteen and the petitioners are the workmen of the respondent. Therefore, I hold that the case of the petitioners squarely falls within the ambit of Industrial Disputes Act and the termination passed by the management is illegal and in contravention of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Therefore, both these issues are answered in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent.

RELIEF

16. Keeping in view the aforesaid findings and discussions, I hold that the case of the petitioners is wholly covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and their

termination is illegal and unlawful. Therefore, all the petitioners are entitled for re-instatement with full back wages. However, keeping in view the judgment, which has been cited hereinabove, the following conditions shall be followed by the respondent management, firstly that the petitioners must be medically fit according to the standards prescribed by the Corporation. Hence, the petition is accepted and the reference is answered according with no costs. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for its publication.

Announced in the Open Court today this 12th Day of November, 1999.

Seal.

M. R. CHAUDHARY,
Presiding Judge.H. P. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court,
Shimla.

बहुदेशीय परियोजनाएं एवं विद्युत विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 14 जनवरी, 2000

संख्या विद्युत-छ-(5)11/99.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश विद्युत परिषद् जो कि भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) की धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी0सी0) के अन्तर्गत सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है, के द्वारा अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव गुम्मा, तहसील चिड़गांव, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश में गुम्मा विद्युत परियोजना के विद्युत गृह के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करने अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि नीचे विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिये भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इसमें सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु यह घोषणा की जाती है और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद्, थिसल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3 को उक्त भूमि अर्जन के लिए आदेश देने का एतद्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. इसके अतिरिक्त उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियां का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल यह निर्देश देते हैं कि अत्यावश्यक मामला होने के कारण भूमि अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद्, थिसल बैंक भवन, शिमला-3 उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन नोटिस के प्रकाशन से 15 दिन की अवधि समाप्त होने पर पंचाट देने से पूर्व भूमि का कब्जा ले सकता है।

4. भूमि का रेखांक भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत परिषद्, थिसल बैंक भवन, शिमला के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरणी

जिला : शिमला		तहसील : चिड़गांव	
ग्राम	खसरा नं०	रकबा (हैक्टेयर में)	
1	2	3	4
गुम्मा	205/3	0	25 82
	204	0	00 46
	206	0	00 64
किल्ला .. 3		0	26 92

आदेश द्वारा,

अजय त्यागी,
आयुक्त एवं सचिव (विद्युत)।

लोक निर्माण विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 11 जनवरी, 2000

संख्या पी0बी0डब्ल्यू0(बी)ए(7)1-14/99.—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव फाटी जलू कोटी चौग, तहसील ब जिला कुल्लू में फाट जलू सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणी में बंणित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा, भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सभी सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों की सूचना के लिए घोषणा की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, कुल्लू को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन करने के आदेश देने का एतद्वारा निर्देश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, कुल्लू के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरणी

जिला : कुल्लू		तहसील : कुल्लू	
गांव	खसरा नं०	क्षेत्र (घोषा बिस्वा)	
1	2	3	4
फाटी जलू	1866/1	0	04 04
	352/1	0	08 00
	350/1	0	01 00
	327/1	0	01 04
	327/2	0	01 05
	348/1	0	00 18
	329/1	0	00 15
	317/1	0	08 08
	316/1	0	05 12
	315/1	0	06 02
	314	0	05 00
	313/1	0	01 18
	2017/1	0	15 09
	2018/1	0	02 14
	2018/2	0	01 01
	658/1	0	11 03
	1955/1	0	01 17
	658/2	0	02 17
	1955/2	0	01 15
	2016/1	0	14 13
	659/1	0	02 17
	657/1	0	08 05
किल्ला ..	22	5	14 17

किल्ला ..

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
वित्तामुक्त एवं सचिव।

राजस्व विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 7 जनवरी, 2000

संख्या रैब(पी0डी0)ई(3)2/99.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 258 (1) के अधीन विकास मन्त्रालय

परन्तु उ
विचार किया
पद के अर्जित
पद के अर्जित
पद के अर्जित
पद के अर्जित
पद के अर्जित
पद के अर्जित

विकास विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या एस0 ओ0 782-1985-10-85 द्वारा भू-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 के अधीन जिन करने के प्रयोजन के लिए अपने कृत्य हिमाचल प्रदेश को सौंप दिये हैं।

और हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि निर्माण बोर्ड द्वारा जो कि केन्द्रिय सरकार का एक अंग/ग है, लोक व्यय पर लोक प्रयोजन के लिए अर्थात् पौंग बाण्य लाशय क्षेत्र के लिये टोका रेल, मौजा रेल, तहसील देहरा जिला गंडा में भूमि अर्जित की जानी सम्भाव्य है। अतः एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे परिशेख की भूमि उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अर्जित की जानी अपेक्षित है।

3. यह अधिसूचना भू-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा-4 के उपबन्धों के अधीन सम्बन्धित व्यक्तियों की जानकारी के लिए जारी की जाती है।

4. हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कार्य में तत्समय प्रवृत्त अधिकारियों की कर्मचारियों और उनके कर्मचारों सहित, परिशेख में किसी भूमि में प्रवेश और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उक्त धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित या अनुमत सभी कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करते हैं।

भाग-2—वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएँ इत्यादि

—शून्य—

भाग-3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैन्शियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि

कायिक (नियुक्ति-II) विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 1 दिसम्बर, 1999

संख्या पर (एपी-II) की (2)-9/98.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 318 के साथ पठित अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हिमाचल प्रदेश, लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग में रैस्टोरर (वर्ग-III) (अराजपन्नित) के पद के लिए इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न उपाबन्ध "क" के अनुसार भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग रैस्टोरर (वर्ग-III) (अराजपन्नित), भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1999 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपल, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. निरसन और व्यावृत्तियाँ.—(1) इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या पी0 ई0 आर0 (एपी-II) की (2)-4/75, दिनांक 12-9-1975 द्वारा अधिसूचित हिमाचल प्रदेश पब्लिक सर्विस कमिशन क्लास-III सर्विसिज/पौस्टर्स रेकूटमेंट एण्ड प्रमोशन रूज, 1975 का उस विस्तार तक निरसन किया जाता है जहाँ तक कि ये रैस्टोरर के पद से सम्बन्धित हो।

(2) ऐसे निरसन के होते हुए भी एवं उप-नियम (1) के अधीन निरसित नियमों के अधीन की गई कोई नियुक्ति, बात या कार्यवाई इन नियमों के अधीन विधिमान्य रूप में की गई समझी जाएगी।

आदेश द्वारा,

ए0 के0 गोस्वामी,
मुख्य सचिव।

उपाबन्ध "क"

हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के कार्यालय में रैस्टोरर (वर्ग-III) (अराजपन्नित) के पद के लिए भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम

1. पद का नाम

रैस्टोरर

5. अत्याधिक आवश्यकता को दृष्टि में रखते हुए राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (4) के अधीन यह भी निदेश देते हैं कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-5ए के उपबन्ध इस मामले में लागू नहीं होंगे।

जिला : कांगड़ा		विनिर्देश	
		तहसील : कतेहतुर	
		परिशेख	परिशेख
गांव	हृदबन्ध नं0	घसरा नं0	हृदबन्ध में
कटराह	134/1	1424/263	2-03-05
नमकर	137/6	1644/2	0-48-72
		जोड़ ..	2-51-77

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
बिनापुक्त एवं सचिव।

2. पदों की संख्या

1 (एक)

3. वर्गीकरण

वर्ग-II (अराजपन्नित)

4. वेतनमान

रु0 3120-100-3220-110-
3660-120-4260-140-
4400-150-5000-160-
5160.

5. चयन पद अथवा अचयन पद

अचयन

6. सीधी भर्ती किये जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिये आयु।

18 से 38 वर्ष :

परन्तु सीधी भर्ती के लिए ऊपरी आयु सीमा तदर्थ या संविदा पर नियुक्त किए गए पहले में सरकार की सेवा में रत व्यक्तियों सहित अभ्यर्थियों को लागू नहीं होगी :

परन्तु यह और कि यदि तदर्थ आधार पर नियुक्त किया गया अभ्यर्थी इस रूप में नियुक्ति की तारीख को अधिक आयु का हो गया हो, तो वह तदर्थ या संविदा के आधार पर, नियुक्ति के कारण विहित आयु में छूट के लिए पात्र नहीं होगा :

परन्तु यह और कि अनुसूचित जातियों/अनुसूचित जनजातियों तथा अन्य वर्गों के व्यक्तियों के लिए उच्चतम आयु सीमा में उनकी ही छूट दी जा सकेगी जितनी कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार के माधारेण या विशेष आदेशों के अधीन अनुज्ञेय है :

परन्तु यह और भी कि पब्लिक सेक्टर निगमों तथा स्वायत्त निकायों के सभी कर्मचारियों को, जो ऐसे पब्लिक सेक्टर नियमों तथा स्वायत्त निकायों के

प्रारम्भिक गठन के समय ऐसे पब्लिक सेक्टर निगमों/स्वायत्त निकायों में शामिल होने से पूर्व सरकारी कर्मचारी थे, सीधी भर्ती में आयु सीमा में ऐसी ही गिन्यात दी जायेगी जैसी सरकारी कर्मचारियों को अनुज्ञेय है। निम्न प्रकार की गिन्यात पब्लिक सेक्टर निगमों तथा स्वायत्त निकायों के ऐसे कर्मचारीवृन्द को नहीं दी जायेगी जो पश्चात्तर्फी ऐन निगमों/स्वायत्त निकायों द्वारा नियुक्त किये गये थे/किये गये हैं और उन पब्लिक सेक्टर निगमों/स्वायत्त निकायों के प्रारम्भिक गठन के पश्चात्त ऐन निगमों/स्वायत्त निकायों को सेवा में अन्तिम रूप से शामिल किये गये हैं/किए गये थे।

टिप्पण.—(1) सीधी भर्ती के लिये आयु सीमा की गणना, उस वर्ष के प्रथम दिवस से की जाएगी जिसमें कि पद (पदों) को व्यापक स्थिति, आवेदन आमन्त्रित करने के लिए विज्ञापित किया जाता है या नियोजनलयों की अधिसूचित किया जाता है।

(2) अन्यथा सम्प्रति अभ्यर्थियों की दशा में सीधी भर्ती के लिए आयु सीमा और अनुभव आयोग के विवेकानुसार शिथिल किया जा सकेगा।

7. सीधी भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए अपेक्षित न्यूनतम शैक्षणिक और अन्य अर्हताएं।

अनिवार्य योग्यताएं : किसी मान्यता प्राप्त बोर्ड/विश्व विद्यालय से दसवीं पास या इसके समकक्ष।

बांछनीय अर्हताएं :

हिमाचल प्रदेश की रूढ़ियों, रीतियों और वंशियों का ज्ञान और प्रदेश में विद्यमान विशिष्ट दशाओं में नियुक्ति के लिए उपयुक्तता।

8. सीधी भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए विहित आयु और शैक्षणिक प्रहतायें प्रोन्नति की दशा में लागू होंगी या नहीं ?

आयु: लागू नहीं

शैक्षणिक अर्हताएं: लागू हैं

9. परिवीक्षा की अवधि, यदि कोई हो।

दो वर्ष, जिसका एक वर्ष से अधिक ऐसी और अवधि के लिये विस्तार किया जा सकेगा जैसा कि सक्षम प्राधिकारी विशेष परिस्थितियों में और लिखित कारणों से आदेश दें।

10. भर्ती की पद्धति—भर्ती सीधी होंगी या प्रोन्नति या प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण द्वारा और विभिन्न पद्धतियों द्वारा भरी जाने वाली रिक्तियों की प्रतिशतता।

अन्तर्गत प्रोन्नति द्वारा, ऐसा न होने पर सीधी भर्ती द्वारा।

11. प्रोन्नति, प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण की दशा में श्रेणियां जिन प्रोन्नति, प्रतिनियुक्ति या स्थानान्तरण किया जायेगा।

दफ्तरी में से प्रोन्नति द्वारा जिनका 3 वर्ष का नियमित सेवाकाल, या ग्रेड में 31-3-98 तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, को सम्मिलित करके 3 वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित

सेवाकाल हो, ऐसा न चाहता हों तो संज्ञित की नियमित सेवाकाल या तत्काल ग्रेड में की गई लगातार सेवा को सम्मिलित करके या संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल।

टिप्पण.—(1) प्रोन्नति के सभी मामलों पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति से प्रोन्नति सम्भरण पद में 31-3-1998 तक की गई निरन्तर तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, प्रोन्नति के लिये इन नियमों में यथाविहित सेवाकाल के लिये, इस शर्त के अधीन रहते हुए गणना में ली जाएगी, कि सम्भरण प्रवर्ग में तदर्थ नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार चयन की उचित स्वीकार्य प्रक्रिया को अन्तर्गत के पश्चात् की गई थी। परन्तु यह कि उन सभी मामलों में जिन में कोई कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति सम्भरण पद में अपने कुल सेवाकाल (31-3-1998 तक तदर्थ आधार पर की गई तदर्थ सेवा सहित जो नियमित सेवा/नियुक्ति के अनुसरण में हो, को शामिल करके) के आधार पर उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट उपावन्धों के कारण विचार किए जाने का पात्र हो जाता है, वहां अपने-अपने प्रवर्ग/पद/कांडर में उससे वरिष्ठ सभी व्यक्ति विचार किए जाने के पात्र समझे जायेंगे, और विचार करते समय कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति से ऊपर रखे जायेंगे।

परन्तु उन सभी पदधारियों की, जिन पर प्रोन्नति के लिये विचार किया जाना है, कम से कम तीन वर्ष की न्यूनतम अर्हता सेवा या पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों में विहित सेवा जो भी कम हो, होगी।

परन्तु यह और भी कि, जहां कोई व्यक्ति पूर्वगामी परन्तु की अपेक्षाओं के कारण प्रोन्नति किए जाने सम्बन्धी विचार के लिये अपात्र हो जाता है, वहां उससे कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति भी ऐसी प्रोन्नति के विचार के लिये अपात्र समझा जायेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण.—अन्तिम परन्तु की अन्तर्गत कनिष्ठ पदधारी प्रोन्नति के लिये अपात्र नहीं समझा जायेगा। यदि वरिष्ठ अपात्र व्यक्ति भूतपूर्व सैनिक है, जिसे डिमोबिलाइज्ड ग्रामंड फोर्स परसोनल (रिजर्वेशन आफ वेकेंसीज इन हिमाचल स्टेट नान टेक्नीकल सर्विसिज) रूज, 1972 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो या जिसे एक्स सर्विसमैन (रिजर्वेशन आफ वेकेंसीज इन दी हिमाचल प्रदेश टेक्नीकल सर्विसिज) रूज, 1985 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत भर्ती किया गया हो या इनके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों।

(2) इसी प्रकार स्थाईकरण के सभी मामलों में ऐसे पद पर नियमित

नियुक्ति/प्रोन्नति से पूर्व 31-3-1998 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, सेवाकाल के लिये गणना में ली जायेगी यदि तदर्थ नियमित/प्रोन्नति, भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों के उपबन्धों के अनुसार चयन को उचित स्वीकार्य प्रक्रिया को अपनाने के पश्चात् की गई थी :

परन्तु 31-3-1998 तक की गई उपर्युक्त निर्दिष्ट तदर्थ सेवा को गणना में लेने के पश्चात् जो स्थायीकरण होगा उसके फलस्वरूप पारस्परिक बरीयता अपरिवर्तित रहेगी ।

12. यदि विभागीय प्रोन्नति समिति विद्यमान हो, तो उसकी संरचना ।

13. प्रोन्नति करने में जिन परिस्थितियों में हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग से परामर्श किया जाएगा ।

14. सीधी भर्ती किए जाने वाले व्यक्तियों के लिए अपेक्षा ।

जैसा कि समय-समय पर सरकार द्वारा गठित की जाए ।

जैसा कि विधि द्वारा अपेक्षित हो ।

किसी सेवा या पद पर नियुक्ति के लिए अभ्यर्थी का निम्नलिखित होना अनिवार्य है :—

- (क) भारत का नागरिक, या
- (ख) नेपाल की प्रजा, या
- (ग) भूटान की प्रजा, या
- (घ) तिब्बती शरणार्थी, जो 1 जनवरी, 1962 से पूर्व भारत में स्थाई निवास के आशय से आया हो, या
- (ङ) भारतीय मूल का कोई व्यक्ति जिसने पाकिस्तान, बर्मा, श्रीलंका, पूर्वी अफ्रीका के देशों कोनिया, युगाण्डा, यूनाईटेड रिपब्लिक आफ तंज़ानिया (पहले तांगानिका; और जंजीबार), जॉर्जिया, मालवा, जेयरे और ईथोपिया से भारत में स्थाई निवास के आशय से प्रवास किया है :

परन्तु प्रवर्ग (ख), (ग), (घ) और (ङ) के अभ्यर्थी ऐसे व्यक्ति होंगे जिनके पक्ष में भारत सरकार द्वारा पात्रता प्रमाण-पत्र जारी किया गया हो ।

ऐसे अभ्यर्थी को, जिनके मामले में पात्रता प्रमाण-पत्र आवश्यक हो, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग या अन्य भर्ती प्राधिकरण द्वारा संचालित परीक्षा/माधात्कार में प्रविष्ट किया जा सकेगा, किन्तु उसे नियुक्ति का प्रस्ताव, भारत सरकार द्वारा उसे पात्रता का अपेक्षित प्रमाण-पत्र जारी किये जाने के पश्चात् ही दिया जाएगा ।

15. सीधी भर्ती द्वारा पद पर नियुक्ति के लिये चयन ।

सीधी भर्ती के मामले में, पद पर नियुक्ति के लिए चयन, मौखिक परीक्षा के आधार पर और यदि, यथास्थिति, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग या अन्य भर्ती प्राधिकरण ऐसा करना आवश्यक या समीचीन समझे, लिखित परीक्षा या व्यवहारिक परीक्षा के आधार पर

किया जाएगा, जिसका स्तर पाठ्य-क्रम यथास्थिति; आयोग/अन्य भर्ती प्राधिकरण द्वारा निर्धारित किया जाएगा ।

16. आरक्षण

उक्त सेवा में नियुक्ति, हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर अनुसूचित जातियों/अनुसूचित जनजातियों/पिछड़े वर्गों और अन्य प्रवर्ग के व्यक्तियों के लिए सेवाओं में आरक्षण की बाबत जारी किए गए अनुदेशों के अधीन होगी ।

17. शिथिल करने की शक्ति

जहां राज्य सरकार को यह राय हो कि ऐसा करना आवश्यक या समीचीन है, वहां यह कारणों को अभिलिखित करके, और हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से, आदेश द्वारा इन नियमों के किन्हीं उपबन्धों को किसी वर्ग या व्यक्तियों के प्रवर्ग या पदों की बाबत शिथिल कर सकेगी ।

[Authoritative English text of this Department Notification No. Per. (AP. B) B(2)-9/98, dated 1st December, 1999 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PERSONNEL (AP-II) DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 1st December, 1999

No. Per.(AP. B) B (2)-9/98.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 read with Article 318 of the Constitution of India, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission is pleased to make the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post of Restorer, Non-Gazetted (Class-III) in the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission as per Annexure "A" attached to this notification, namely :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, Restorer, Non-Gazetted (Class-III) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1999.

(2) These rules shall come into force from the date of their publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Repeal and savings.*—(1) The Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission Class-III Services/Posts Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1975 notified vide this Department notification No. Per. (AP-II) B (2)-4/75, dated 12-9-1975 are hereby repealed to the extent these are applicable to the post of Restorer.

(2) Notwithstanding such repeal, any appointment made or anything done or any action taken under the rules so repealed under sub-rule (1) *supra* shall be deemed to validly have made or done or taken under these rules.

By order,

A. K. GOSWAMI,
Chief Secretary.

ANNEXURE "A"

RECRUITMENT AND PROMOTION RULES FOR
THE POST OF RESTORER CLASS-III (NON-
GAZETTED) IN THE OFFICE OF HIMACHAL
PRADESH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1. Name of the post Restorer
2. Number of posts 1 (One)
3. Classification Class-III (Non-Gazetted)
4. Scale of pay Rs. 3120-100-3220-110-3660-
120-4260-140-4400-150-5000-
160-5160.
5. Whether selection post or non-selection post. Non-selection
6. Age for direct recruitment. Between 18 and 38 years;

Provided that the upper age limit for direct recruits will not be applicable to the candidates already in service of the Government including those who have been appointed on *ad hoc* basis or on contract basis:

Provided further that if a candidate appointed on *ad hoc* basis or on contract basis had become overage on the date when he was appointed as such he shall not be eligible for any relaxation in the prescribed age limit by virtue of his such *ad hoc* or contract appointment :

Provided further that upper age limit is relaxable for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Other categories of persons to the extent permissible under the general or special order(s) of the Himachal Pradesh Government:

Provided further that the employees of all the Public Sector Corporations and Autonomous Bodies who happened to be Government servants before absorption in Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies at the time of initial constitutions of such Corporations / Autonomous Bodies shall be allowed age concession in direct recruitment as admissible to Government servants. This concession will not, however, be admissible to such staff of the Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies who were/are subsequently appointed by such Corporations/Autonomous Bodies and who are/were finally absorbed in the service of such Corporations/Autonomous Bodies after initial constitution of the Public Sector Corporations/Autonomous Bodies.

Note.—(1) Age limit for direct recruitment will be reckoned on the first day of the year in which the post(s)

is/are advertised for invitation applications or notified the Employment Exchange or as the case may be.

(2) Age and experience in the case of direct recruitment, relaxable at the discretion of the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission in case the candidate is otherwise well qualified.

7. Minimum educational and other qualifications required for direct recruits.

Essential Qualification :
Should have passed Matriculation or its equivalent from a recognised Board/University.

Desirable Qualification:

Knowledge of customs, manners and dialects of Himachal Pradesh and suitability for appointment in the peculiar conditions prevailing in the Pradesh.

8. Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for direct recruits will apply in the case of the promotees.

Age : Not applicable
Educational Qualification : yes.

9. Period of probation, if any.

Two years subject to such further extension for a period not exceeding one year as may be ordered by the competent authority in special circumstances and for reasons to be recorded in writing.

10. Method of recruitment—whether by direct recruitment or by promotion, deputation, transfer and the percentage of vacancies to be filled in by various methods.

100% by promotion failing which by direct recruitment.

11. In case of recruitment by promotion, deputation, transfer, grade from which promotion/deputation/transfer is to be made.

By promotion from amongst the *Daftis* having 3 years regular service or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* (rendered up to 31-3-1998) service in the grade, failing which by promotion from amongst the Peon having 5 years regular service or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* (rendered upto 31-3-98) in the grade.

(1) In all cases of promotion, the continuous *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post up to 31-3-1998, if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the condition that the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion in the feeder category had been made after following proper acceptable process of selection in accordance with the provisions of R&P Rules provided that :

परन्तु
विचार कि
पद के भर्ती
...
परन्तु
की अपेक्षा
अप्राप्त हो
विचार के

(i) In all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered on *ad hoc* basis upto 31-3-1998) followed by regular service/appointment in the feeder post in view of the provision referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/cadre shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration and placed above the junior person in the field of consideration :

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of at least three years or that prescribed in the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post, whichever is less :

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

Explanation.—The last proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion if the senior ineligible persons happened to be Ex-servicemen recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of Vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical Services) Rules, 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of Ex-servicemen (Reservation of Vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules, 1985 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder.

(2) Similarly in all cases of confirmation, continuous *ad hoc* service rendered on the feeder post upto 31-3-1998, if any, prior to the regular appointment against such post shall be taken into account towards the length of service, if the *ad hoc* appointment/promotion had been made after proper selection and in accordance with the provision of the Recruitment and Promotion Rules:

Provided that *inter-se* seniority as a result of confirmation after taking into account *ad hoc* service rendered upto 31-3-1998 as referred to above shall remain unchanged.

12. If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists, what is its composition.

As may be constituted by the Government from time to time.

13. Circumstances under which the H.P.P.S.C. is to be consulted in making recruitment.

As required under the law

14. Essential requirement for a direct recruitment.

A candidate for appointment to any service or post must be :—

- (a) a citizen of India, or
- (b) a subject of Nepal, or
- (c) a subject of Bhutan, or
- (d) a Tibetan refugee who came over to India before the 1st January, 1962 with the intention of permanently settling in India, or
- (e) a person of Indian origin who has migrated from Pakistan, Burma, Sri Lanka, East African countries of Kenya, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika and Zanzibar), Zambia, Malawi, Zaire and Ethiopia with the intention of permanently settling in India :

Provided that a candidate belonging to categories (b), (c), (d) and (e) shall be a person in whose favour a certificate of eligibility has been issued by the Government of India.

A candidate in whose case a certificate of eligibility is necessary may be admitted to an examination or interview conducted by the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission or other recruiting authority, but the offer of appointment may be given only after the necessary eligibility certificate has been issued to him by the Government of India.

15. Selection for appointment to post by direct recruitment.

Selection for appointment to the post in the case of direct recruitment shall be made on the basis of *viva voce* test, if the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission or other recruiting authority, as the case may be so consider necessary or expedient by a written test, or a practical test, the standard/syllabus etc. of which will be determined by the Commission/other recruiting authority as the case may be.

16. Reservation

The appointment to the service shall be subject to orders regarding reservation in the service for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/other Backward Classes/Other categories of persons issued by the Himachal Pradesh Government from time to time.

17. Power to relax

Where the State Government is of the opinion that it is necessary or expedient to do so, it may by order for reasons to be recorded in writing and in consultation

with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission relax any of the provisions of these rules with respect to any class or category of persons or posts.

भाग-4—स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटकाइड और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग

-अन्य-

भाग-5—वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

न्यायालय उपमण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, भटियात (चुवाड़ी), जिला चम्बा हिमाचल प्रदेश

बजे पैरवी मुकद्दमा हेतु हाजिर अदालत खुण्डियां आगे। गैर-हाजरी की सूत में कार्यवाही एकतरफा अमल में लाई जावगी।

गुडो देवी विधवा रथ, निवासी गांव जुमनेड, परगना भट्ट टिकरी, सब-तहसील तियुस्ता, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथिया।

आज दिनांक 13-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जारी किया गया।

बनाम

मोहर।

आम जनता

हस्ताक्षरित/-

सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

इशतहार जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती गुडो देवी विधवा रथ, निवासी जमनेड ने एक प्रार्थना-पत्र ब्यान हल्की सहित प्रस्तुत करके प्रार्थना की है कि उनके बच्चों क्रमशः सपना देवी जन्म तिथि 20-10-1994 व लड़के विजय कुमार की जन्म तिथि 1-6-1996 की है किन्तु पंचायत रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं है। दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी किए जायें।

इशतहार

कार्यालय उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, उप-मण्डल कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिओ जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

लिहाजा सर्वसाधारण जनता को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त बच्चों की जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने वाले किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह अपना उजर व एतराज दिनांक 10-2-2000 को या इससे पूर्व इस न्यायालय में हाजर होकर प्रस्तुत करें अन्यथा उपरोक्त बच्चों की जन्म तिथियां दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

संजय कुमार

बनाम

आम जनता।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

आज दिनांक 20-12-1999 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

श्री संजय कुमार पुत्र रामा नन्द, निवासी गांव सांगला, तहसील सांगला, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त प्रस्तुत की है कि उनके परिवार के निम्नलिखित सदस्यों का नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत सांगला के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है। अतः इसका नाम व जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण हेतु सम्बन्धित पंचायत को आदेश जारी करने की कृपा करें:—

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
चुवाड़ी, जिला चम्बा।

निकेश पुत्र संजय कुमार, जन्म तिथि 10-10-1998

व अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगडा (हि 0 प्र 0)

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण हेतु कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10-2-2000 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन अदालत हाजिर आकर प्रस्तुत करें वरना एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर, उपरोक्त व्यक्ति का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे।

मिसल 4/99, 5/99 ता 0 पेसी 7-2-2000/16-2-2000 दावा दख्ती इन्द्राज लाभ सिंह व सानी राम पुत्रान गुलावा, निवासी सोली, मौजा सिहोरवाला, तहसील खुण्डियां।

बनाम

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

वलदेव सिंह पुत्र सन्त राम आदि, निवासी महाल सोली, मौजा सिहोरवाला, तहसील खुण्डियां।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-मण्डल कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिओ,
जिला किन्नौर (हि 0 प्र 0)।

प्रार्थना-पत्र दख्ती इन्द्राज वखाना काश्त व कब्जा लगाने हेतु खाता नं 6 मि 0, खतीनी नं 50 ख 0 कित्ता 26, रकबा 1-13-91 है 0 मुहाल सोली व खाता नं 10, खतीनी नं 26 नं 0 खाता 52, रकबा 0-46-62 है 0 मुहाल प्रौष्टां मौजा सिहोरवाला, तहसील खुण्डियां।

इशतहार

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवान बाला दख्ती इन्द्राज में उक्त प्रतिवादीगण श्री वलदेव सिंह, जोगिन्द सिंह, हरभजन सिंह पुत्रान सन्ता, निवासी सोली, मौजा सिहोरवाला नौकर फौज में है की तामील समन साधारण ढंग से न हो रही है।

कार्यालय उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, उप-मण्डल कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिओ जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिरपाल सिंह

बनाम

आम जनता।

अतः उपरोक्त फौकन को बजरिया इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है कि वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 7-2-2000 प्रातः 10

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

परन्तु
विचारकिय
पद के भर्ती
परन्तु
की अपक्षा
अप्राप्त हो
विचार के

श्री हिरपाल सिंह पुत्र श्री उधम लाल, निवासी गांव पांगी, तहसील कल्पा, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त प्रस्तुत की है कि उनके परिवार के निम्नलिखित सदस्यों का नाम व जन्म तिथियां ग्राम पंचायत पांगी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं हैं। अतः इनका नाम व जन्म तिथियां पंजीकरण हेतु सम्बन्धित पंचायत को आदेश जारी करने की कृपा करें:—

1. अनूप नेगी पुत्र हिरपाल सिंह, जन्म तिथि 8-4-1998
2. मोनिका नेगी पुत्री हिरपाल सिंह, जन्म तिथि 13-6-1998

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त नाम व जन्म तिथियां पंजीकरण हेतु कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10-2-2000 को सुबह 10.00 बजे अमालतन या वकालतन अदालत हज़ा में हाज़िर आकर प्रस्तुत करे वरना एक तरफ़ा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर, उपरोक्त व्यक्तियों के नाम पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-मण्डल कल्पा स्थित रिकांग-पिछो,
जिला किन्नौर (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री गोकुल चन्द शर्मा, उ-पंजीकरण, सदर मण्डो,
जिला मण्डो, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकद्दमा:—

श्री तेज राम शर्मा पुत्र श्री अन्त राम, निवासी मकान नम्बर 40/13, रामनगर, मण्डो, जिला मण्डो, हिमाचल प्रदेश .. फरीकअबल।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

.. फरीक दोषम।

प्रार्थना-पत्र वाकत पंजीकृत किये जाने वसीयतनामा जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1908.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

उपरोक्त विषय में ग्राम जनता को बजरीया इशतहार हज़ा आगाह किया जाता है कि श्रीमती बिमला देवी पत्नी श्री नन्त राम पुत्र परमा, निवासी मकान नम्बर 40/13, रामनगर मण्डो, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने अपने जीते जो पूर्ण होश व हवास के रुख़ गवाहन एक वसीयतनामा श्री तेज राम शर्मा पुत्र श्री अन्त राम शर्मा, निवासी मकान नम्बर 40/13, रामनगर तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डो, हिमाचल प्रदेश के नाम तैहरी करवाया है। वसीयत दहिन्दा अब वफात पा चुका है। प्रार्थी ने स्वयं हाज़िर आकर वसीयतनामा बराये पंजीकरण जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1908 के अन्तर्गत पेश किया।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरीया इशतहार हज़ा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस वसीयतनामा के पंजीकरण बारे किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह अपना उजर दिनांक 8-2-2000 को प्रातः 10 बजे इस अदालत में स्वयं हाज़िर आकर पेश करे अन्यथा वसीयतनामा जेर धारा 40/41 भारतीय पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1908 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकृत किया जायगा।

आज दिनांक 24-12-1999 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

गोकुल चन्द शर्मा,
उप-पंजीकाध्यक्ष,
सदर मण्डो, जिला मण्डो,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री डी0 डी0 शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रामो),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री नेक राम सुपुत्र श्री राम दास, निवासी ग्राम घेच, डाक-घर कोहवाग, तहसील व जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 वाकत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री नेक राम ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुज़ारा है कि उसके बेटे रीणव कुमार का नाम तथा जन्म तिथि 16-6-1997 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत घेच के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है। वह उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत शपथ-पत्र व पटवारी हल्का की रिपोर्ट तथा राजपत्र में विज्ञापन ग्राम जनता के प्रचार हेतु प्रकाशित करने के लिए मु0 60/- रुपये के भारतीय पोस्टल आर्डर प्रस्तुत कर रखे हैं।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक के बेटे का नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत घेच (कोहवाग) के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आप-तिनामा दिनांक 10-2-2000 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाज़िर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

डी0 डी0 शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा0),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री डी0 डी0 शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा0),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रीतम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री जीत राम, निवासी ग्राम डोगरापुल,
डाकघर ब्योलिया, तहसील व जिला शिमला।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 वाकत नाम व मृत्यु तिथि पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे।

श्री प्रीतम सिंह ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय के साथ गुज़ारा है कि उसकी चाची श्रीमती सरजू देवी की मृत्यु तिथि 22-3-1999 को हुई। उनका नाम ग्राम पंचायत पुजारली के अभिलेख से काट दिया जाए। जिसके लिए उसने अपना शपथ-पत्र व पटवारी हल्का की रिपोर्ट तथा राजपत्र में विज्ञापन ग्राम जनता के प्रचार हेतु प्रकाशित करने के लिए मु0 60/- रुपये के भारतीय पोस्टल आर्डर प्रस्तुत कर रखे हैं।

अतः इस अदालती इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक की चाची का नाम उनकी ग्राम पंचायत पुजारली के अभिलेख से काटने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आप-तिनामा दिनांक 10-2-2000 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाज़िर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख से नाम काट देने के आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

डी० डी० शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री डी० डी० शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती कृष्णा शर्मा पत्नी श्री एम० आर० शर्मा, निवासी ग्राम
रोड़ी, डाकघर पैणी, तहसील सुन्नी, जिला शिमला ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969 बाबत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत
अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे ।

श्रीमती कृष्णा शर्मा ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस
आशय के साथ गुजारा है कि (उसका) श्रीमती कृष्णा शर्मा का नाम
तथा जन्म तिथि 14-4-1970 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत नीन के अभिलेख
में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है । वह उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम
पंचायत शपथ-पत्र व पटवारी हल्का की रिपोर्ट तथा राजपत्र में
विज्ञापन ग्राम जनता के प्रचार हेतु प्रकाशित करने के लिए मु०
60/- रुपये भारतीय पोस्टल आर्डर प्रस्तुत कर रखे हैं ।

अतः इस अदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण जनता को
सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक का
नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत नीन के अभिलेख में
दर्ज करने में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक
10-2-2000 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर
प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को
नाम व जन्म तिथि उनकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के
आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
सहित जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

डी० डी० शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री डी० डी० शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री रूप राम पुत्र श्री चेत राम, निवासी ग्राम तमरोह,
डाकघर परगना बड़ावल, तहसील सुन्नी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल
प्रदेश ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969 बाबत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत
अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे ।

श्री रूप राम ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय
के साथ गुजारा है कि उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि 18-5-1958
उनकी ग्राम पंचायत बभनपुर के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है ।
वह उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत शपथ-पत्र व पटवारी
हल्का की रिपोर्ट तथा राजपत्र में विज्ञापन ग्राम जनता के प्रचार
हेतु प्रकाशित करने के लिए मु० 60/- रुपये के भारतीय पोस्टल
आर्डर प्रस्तुत कर रखे हैं ।

अतः इस अदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित
किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक का नाम व
जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने में
कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक
10-2-2000 तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर
प्रस्तुत कर सकता है अन्यथा सचिव सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को
नाम व जन्म तिथि उसकी पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के
आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 10-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
सहित जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

डी० डी० शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत श्री डी० डी० शर्मा, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री प्रेम सिंह सुपुत्र श्री हीरू राम, निवासी ग्राम खील,
डाकघर दरभोग, तहसील व जिला शिमला (हि० प्र०) ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण
अधिनियम, 1969 बाबत नाम व जन्म तिथि पंचायत अभि-
लेख में दर्ज करने बारे ।

श्री प्रेम सिंह ने इस अदालत में एक आवेदन-पत्र इस आशय
के साथ गुजारा है कि उसकी बेटी कुमारी राधा देवी का नाम
व जन्म तिथि 21-8-1981 उनकी ग्राम पंचायत दरभोग के
अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं कर रखी है । वह उसका नाम व जन्म
तिथि ग्राम पंचायत शपथ-पत्र व पटवारी हल्का की रिपोर्ट तथा
राजपत्र में विज्ञापन ग्राम जनता के प्रचार हेतु प्रकाशित करने के
लिए मु० 60/- रुपये के भारतीय पोस्टल आर्डर प्रस्तुत कर
रखे हैं ।

अतः इस अदालती इस्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया
जाता है कि यदि किसी को भी उक्त आवेदक की बेटी का नाम
व तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत दरभोग के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने
में कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह अपना आपत्तिनामा दिनांक 10-2-2000
तक या उससे पूर्व इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर
सकता है अन्यथा सचिव सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत को नाम व
जन्म तिथि उनकी ग्राम पंचायत के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के
आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक दिनांक 10-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर
अदालत सहित जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

डी० डी० शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी (ग्रा०),
शिमला, जिला शिमला,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ।

व अदालत उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला
सिरमौर (हि० प्र०)

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र उदय राम, निवासी शमाहां, तहसील
कमरऊ ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र उदय राम, निवासी शमाहां, तहसील पांवटा
ने इस अदालत में ग्राम हलफिया सहित प्रार्थना-पत्र दिया है कि
ग्राम पंचायत कमरऊ के रिकार्ड में उसकी पत्नी गुरदेई का नाम

परन्तु
विचार किये
पद के भर्ती
परन्तु
की अपक्षा
अप्राप्त है
विचार के

रणजीत सिंह के नाम पर दर्ज किया हुआ है जो कि गलत है। जबकि उसकी पत्नी गुरदेई परिवार की सदस्य है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि इस मामले में किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 5-2-2000 से पूर्व अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत या बकालत आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है। निश्चित तिथि पर कोई एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में श्री आत्मा राम के प्रार्थना-पत्र पर आगामी कार्यवाही कर दी जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 6-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

व अदालत श्री राहुल आनन्द, भा0 प्र0 से0, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

श्री कल्याण सिंह पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी कमरऊ, तहसील पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता।

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री कल्याण सिंह पुत्र श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी कमरऊ, तहसील पांवटा साहिब ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके लड़के प्रवीण का जन्म दिनांक 4-3-96 को हुआ था परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उसका नाम व जन्म तिथि ग्राम पंचायत कमरऊ के रिकार्ड में 4-3-93 दर्ज को गई है जो गलत है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के माफ्त सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 5-2-2000 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा में अदालत या बकालत हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री कल्याण सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 6-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राहुल आनन्द, भा0 प्र0 से0,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब,
जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

व अदालत श्री राहुल आनन्द, भा0 प्र0 से0, उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री गुरदेव सिंह पुत्र श्री संतोष सिंह, निवासी बट्टीपुर, तहसील पांवटा, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969.

श्री गुरदेव सिंह पुत्र श्री संतोष सिंह, निवासी बट्टीपुर, पांवटा ने इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना-पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पिता संतोष सिंह की मृत्यु दिनांक 23-10-99 को हुई थी परन्तु अज्ञानतावश वह उनकी मृत्यु तिथि ग्राम पंचायत बट्टीपुर के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करवा सका।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार के माफ्त सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे किसी को कोई उजर/एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 11-2-2000 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हजा स्थित पांवटा में अदालत या बकालत हाजिर आकर दर्ज करा सकता है। निर्धारित अवधि के पश्चात् कोई आपत्ति प्राप्त न होने की सूत्र में प्रार्थना-पत्र श्री गुरदेव सिंह पर नियमानुसार कार्यवाही की जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 12-1-2000 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व कार्यालय मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

राहुल आनन्द, भा0 प्र0 से0,
उप-मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
पांवटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

In the Court of Shri J. N. Barowalia, District Judge, Una, District Una, Himachal Pradesh

Civil Appeal No. 142 of 1998

Amar Nath Versus Dilbag Singh etc.
To

3. Tripta Devi, daughter, 4. Sanjeev son, 5. Smt. Sudesh Kumari daughters of Makhmal Devi d/o Krishana, 6. Smt. Rani d/o Bimla Devi d/o Kishana, all caste Rajput, resident of Village Bahhu, Majra Kalua, Sub-Tehsil Haroli, District Una, Himachal Pradesh.
— Defendants/Respondents.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above named defendants can not be served through an ordinary mode of service as the ordinary summons issued to them have been received back unserved.

Hence proclamation under order 5, Rule 20, C. P. C. is hereby issued requiring them to appear in this court on 9-2-2000, at 10 A.M. personally, through an Advocate or authorised agent to defend the case, failing which *ex parte* proceedings shall be taken against them according to law.

Given under my hand and the seal of the court this the 7th day of January, 2000.

Seal. J. N. BAROWALIA,
District Judge, Una,
District Una, Himachal Pradesh.

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

सुरजीत सिंह बनाम ग्राम जनता।

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री सुरजीत सिंह पुत्र श्री सुखदेव सिंह, निवासी गांव भदसाली, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री मीनिका देवी का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जाव।

इसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 1-1-1994 है तथा बच्ची का जन्म गांव भदसाली है।

इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा यकतरफा कार्य-वाही अमल में लाई जा कर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई उजर/आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 5-2-2000 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा यकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 5-1-2000 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
मोहर। नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

आज दिनांक 5-1-2000 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

हस्ताक्षरित/-
मोहर। नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)।

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

मोहेन्द्र सिंह बनाम ग्राम जनता।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री मोहेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री मल्ली राम, निवासी गांव सलोह, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पुत्र अजय कुमार का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जावे। इसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 7-8-1994 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव सलोह है।

व अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा : जन्म तिथि प्रमाण-पत्र।

रामेश चन्द बनाम ग्राम जनता।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम ग्राम जनता।

श्री रामेश चन्द पुत्र श्री लखपत राये, निवासी गांव ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री पूनक सन्धी का नाम पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया जा सका है और अब दर्ज करवाया जावे। इसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 5-11-1989 है तथा बच्ची का जन्म गांव ऊना है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई उजर/आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 5-2-2000 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा असालतन या वकालतन इस अदालत में हाजिर आ कर पेश करें अन्यथा यकतरफा कार्य-वाही अमल में लाई जा कर प्रमाण-पत्र जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 5-1-2000 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई उजर/आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 5-2-2000 को प्रातः दस बजे स्वयं अथवा असालतन या वकालतन

हस्ताक्षरित/-
मोहर। नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, ऊना, तहसील व जिला ऊना (हि0 प्र0)

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन

—शून्य—

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

—शून्य—

अनुपूरक

—शून्य—

परन्तु
विचार किये
पद के भर्ती
परन्तु
की अपेक्षा
अपाने हैं
विचार के

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला-5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित।